

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

MELVIN DEJESUS,

Petitioner,

Case No. 5:04-CV-56

v.

Hon. Gordon J. Quist

KURT JONES,

Respondent.

---

**ORDER DENYING CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**

This is a habeas corpus action brought by a state prisoner pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The court dismissed petitioner's habeas action. This matter is now before the court on petitioner's motion for a certificate of appealability (docket no. 61).

Under the amended provisions of the Habeas Corpus Act, a petitioner may not appeal in a habeas case unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1). Rule 22 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure extends to district judges the authority to issue a certificate of appealability. Fed. R. App. P. 22(b). *See Lyons v. Ohio Adult Parole Auth.*, 105 F.3d 1063, 1073 (6th Cir.1997). Under 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2), the court must determine whether a certificate of appealability should be granted. A certificate should issue if petitioner has demonstrated a "substantial showing of a denial of a constitutional right." *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

This Court denied petitioner's application on the merits. To warrant a grant of the certificate after considering the constitutional claims on the merits, "petitioner must demonstrate that

reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong." *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). Applying this standard, the court finds no basis for issuance of a certificate of appealability. Petitioner has not pointed to any flaw in the court's reasoning or any issue of fact or law overlooked in the adjudication of his petition. Rather, petitioner asserts vague grounds such as "[m]uch of this Court's basis for denying relief was its finding that error, if any, was harmless" and that the court's resolution of the ineffective assistance of counsel claim is "clearly debatable." For the reasons expressed in the magistrate judge's exhaustive report and recommendation, and the court's order adopting the report and recommendation, the court concludes that reasonable jurists could not find that this court's denial of the petition was debatable or wrong.

Accordingly, petitioner's motion for a certificate of appealability is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: October 11, 2007

/s/ Gordon J. Quist  
Gordon J. Quist  
United States District Judge